

---

## **PDF PAGE 7, COLUMN 3**

---

# **DORSEY AND STEPHENS**

# **BUSY IN VALDOSTA**

---

(Special Dispatch to The Journal.)

VALDOSTA, Ga., Oct. 7—Solicitor General Hugh Dorsey and Assistant Solicitor Ed Stephens of Atlanta, are spending this week in Valdosta, preparing the answer to the motion for a new trial which was made by the lawyers for Leo Frank in Atlanta recently.

While Judge Thomas is holding court in Moultrie, Attorneys and Stephens are occupying his office in the county court house, where they have the advantage of his library and can carry on their work without interruption.

---

---

## **PDF PAGE 7, COLUMN 4**

---

# **HENSLEE ANSWERS**

# **PERJURY CHARGES OF FRANK DEFENSE**

---

Fight for New Trial  
Now

Hinges on Charges  
Juror

Was Prejudiced  
Before He

Took Oath

---

The fight for a new trial for Leo M. Frank now hinges apparently around A. H. Henslee, one of the jurors, who has been attacked by the defense as prejudiced before he took the oath of a jurymen.

Although Solicitor General Hugh M. Dorsey and his assistant, E. A. Stephens, are both in Valdosta, studying the legal phases of the case, they are keeping the telegraph wires hot in their efforts to sustain Henslee. The attack of the defense on Juror M. Jochenning has not been as vigorous and is not considered of great importance.

The attack on Juror Henslee has become the paramount issue in the fight for a new trial for Frank, standing way above the 114 other points made in the motion of Attorneys Luther Z. Rosser and Reuben R. Arnold.

Solicitor Dorsey, when he left Atlanta for the south Georgia town, declared that he would make every effort to be ready with his answer to the motion on next Saturday, when the argument of the case is slated to commence before Judge L. S. Roan, of the Stone Mountain circuit. While a tremendous amount of work lies before the solicitor general, it is believed that he will announce "ready" when the case is called, and he is certain to introduce many affidavits and depositions in an effort to sustain Henslee and Jochenning.

Henslee has written a card to The Journal in which he makes clear his position in regard to the attacks made on him by the sworn statements of three Sparta citizens and one Atlanta man.

The juror's statement is as follows:

"Editor The Journal: Replying to your article in today's issue, October 6, in reference to Messrs. Holmes, Johnson and Gray, I will say I am sorry to think that they would go ahead and make such a statement over their signatures that I discussed and tried Leo Frank in their office on July 27."

"Having read their depositions, in solicitor Hugh Dorsey's office. I will say that I spoke of the case freely, and met there many friends in the office on September 2, which was Tuesday morning."

### FRANK NOT MENTIONED.

"I am sorry to think they would express themselves and dare their deposition as they did, either July 27 or June 27. I will say that I was in this office on June 27, but the Frank case was never mentioned."

"As for branding them all liars, I have never done so, but they have mis- calculated the date."

"I did willingly express myself freely regarding the Frank case on September 2, which was after Frank was convicted, Tuesday morning, met many of their friends to whom they introduce me, and did say and express to these friends and to them, that Leo M. Frank, judging from the evidence of Jim Conley, was really a pervert."

"I made a statement to one of the Atlanta papers that I almost positively knew that the depositions received from Sparta, Ga., would not contain anything that I had said prior to the case—that they would be similar to those from Blakely, Ga."

"Regarding the statement that they knew me and my family for years, I wish to state that I hold these gentle- men in the highest esteem, as men whom I believe would defend and honor me and my family regardless of public sentiment."

"I wish to state further, however. that after reading their depositions in Solicitor Dorsey's office. I am surprised that men of their intelligence should come out in a newspaper and request a reply in such a way as they have. As to branding them liars I have never done so. They got their dates wrong, that's all."

"In conclusion considering this as a reply to each one of them personally. instead of branding them as liars, I would gladly defend them at all times."

"Mr. Julius A. Lehman, of the firm of Floyd & Lehman, of the city of Atlanta, makes an affidavit. I understand, to the effect that I stated to him, on either June 2 or 6, while on the train between Atlanta and Experiment, Ga., that I believed Frank guilty. This statement also, I brand as false, as on June 2, 1913, I was on the train between Edison and Arlington, Ga. On June 6, I was on the train between Tifton and Ashburn, Ga."

"Regarding his statement and affidavit, I brand them as absolutely false, and, furthermore, I wish to state that I called on Mr. Lehman personally on Saturday afternoon, October 4, at his place of business, and stated to him, personally, that the only reason I came by was to inform him that I would get a bill of indictment against him when the next grand jury convened in Fulton county for trying to make me out a perjurer. That was all I had to say to him, and I then left his place of business."

"Regarding all of the foregoing statement, I will say that the proof is on record at the Franklin Buggy company's place of business in Barnesville, Ga."

(Signed)  
HENSLEE,

"A. H.

"Barnesville, Ga."

Macon, Ga., October 6.